

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,446,871 to Buckley et al. ("Buckley") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,324 to Sasaki ("Sasaki"). Buckley describes an interactive data transfer system including a computing device and a pen functioning as a bar code reader. Upon the reading of a bar code printed on a sheet of paper by the pen, the bar code data is transmitted to the computing device allowing the computing device to retrieve information identified by the bar code data.

Sasaki describes a method of modulating digital data to be used for transmitting or recording. The method according to one embodiment is described as including the steps of compressing the digital data, adding an error correction checking symbol to the compressed data, performing an interleaving operation on the error correction coded data, converting the interleaved data into modulation codes, collecting a predetermined number of the modulation codes to form a data block, and generating image data in the form of a pattern of dot codes from the data block.

In the present application, independent claim 1 describes a electronic reading device system including an electronic reading device for use with a formatted surface having an address pattern thereon. This element is specifically described as including a sensor for detecting portions of the address pattern, wherein positions of the electronic reading device relative to the formatted surface are determined based on the detected portions of the address pattern. The electronic

reading system further includes a separate electronic device that includes a display screen for displaying feedback relating to the detected portions of the address pattern.

Attention is now drawn to a comparison of the Buckley teachings. Referring to Figure 5, column 1, lines 21-28, column 5, lines 55-61, column 6, lines 43-46, and column 11, line 28 to column 12, line 15, of Buckley, the Office Action has apparently equated the electronic pen 16 with the "electronic reading device" as found in claim 1. The Office Action has also apparently equated the personal computer 104 of Buckley with the "separate electronic device that includes a display screen for displaying feedback relating to the detected portions" as found in claim 1. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Buckley fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of "an electronic reading device for use with a formatted surface having an address pattern thereon, the electronic reading device including a sensor for detecting portions of the address pattern, wherein positions of the electronic reading device relative to the formatted surface are determined based on the detected portions of the address pattern." Buckley describes the use of a pen to read a printed bar code in order to obtain information identified by the bar code. Buckley does not require, nor does it contemplate, tracking a position of the pen relative to the surface on which the bar code is printed. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion by Buckley of determining positions of the pen relative to a formatted surface, much less determining positions of the pen relative to a formatted surface based upon the detected bar code.

The Office Action concedes that Buckley fails to teach a "formatted surface having an address pattern" (see page 2, paragraph 3). The Office Action has attempted to rely upon Sasaki

to overcome this deficiencies of Buckley. However, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Buckley with those of Sasaki to arrive at the invention of claim 1. As previously discussed, Buckley contains no teaching or suggestion by Buckley of determining positions of the pen relative to a formatted surface, much less determining positions of the pen relative to a formatted surface based upon the detected bar code. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art when presented with the teachings of Buckley would not be motivated to use the teachings of Sasaki to arrive at the invention of claim 1.

Furthermore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art was motivated to combine the teachings of Buckley and Sasaki, such a combination would not produce the feature of "wherein positions of the electronic reading device relative to the formatted surface are determined based on the detected portions of the address pattern" as found in claim 1. Referring to Figure 2, column 5, line 63 to column 6, line 5, and column 34, line 65 to col. 35, line 8, of Sasaki, the Office Action has apparently equated the optically readable code pattern having a block header 28 with the "formatted surface having an address pattern thereon" as found in claim 1. The cited portion of Sasaki, (column 34, line 65 to column 35, line 8) describes a method for modulating digital data for printing and recording on a predetermined medium such an optically readable code pattern. The code pattern 26 is described as being formed of a number of blocks 36 having a pattern 30 formed from dot images arranged to correspond with the digital data. The block 36 is further described as including a marker 32 arranged with a predetermined positional relationship

with the dot image pattern, and a block address pattern 28 for indicating the positions of the blocks of the code pattern. During demodulation, as described in column 8, lines 60-67 of Sasaki, an image of the entire code pattern 26 is picked up by an image pick-up system. The markers 32 and block address pattern 28 are detected within the image in order to determine the location and distribution of the data within the pattern 30 of the image. However, the block address pattern 28 is not used to determine the position of the image pick-up system relative to the code pattern 26, as the entire code pattern 26 is read by the image pick-up system before demodulation.

Therefore, Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion by Sasaki of determining positions of an electronic reading device relative to a formatted surface based upon detected portions of an address pattern.

Thus, even if one of ordinary skill in the art was motivated to combine the teachings of Buckley and Sasaki, such a combination would not produce the feature of “wherein positions of the electronic reading device relative to the formatted surface are determined based on the detected portions of the address pattern” as found in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Buckley in view of Sasaki and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding dependent claim 2, dependent claim 2 further recites “wherein the detected portions of the address pattern correspond to information written using the electronic reading device on the formatted surface, said feedback comprising a representation of the information

Appl. No. 09/774,141
Amendment dated July 9, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 04/09/2003

Docket No. 34650-00672USPT
P13979US2

written using the electronic reading device.” The Office Action refers to column 11, line 28 to column 12, line 15 of Buckley as teaching the features of claim 2

Regarding dependent claims 3-4, dependent claims 3-4 further recite “wherein the written information comprises handwritten text, said representation comprising text characters that correspond to the handwritten text,” and “wherein the written information comprises handwritten text, said representation comprising an electronic copy of the handwritten text.” The Office Action refers to column 12, lines 16-27 of Buckley as teaching the features of claims 3 and 4.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action’s characterization of the cited portions of Buckley in regards to claims 2-4. Column 12, lines 16-27 of Buckley describes an embodiment in which “the electronic pen has accelerometers capable of detecting and recording in electronic format characters written by the pen.” Thus, Buckley describes the use of accelerometers to track movement of an electronic pen when characters are written by the electronic pen. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion by Buckley of detecting portions of an address pattern which correspond to information written using an electronic reading device on a formatted surface. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-4 also distinguish over Buckley in view of Sasaki and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 2-4 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 of the present application describes a method for providing electronic reading device feedback. The method includes detecting portions of an address pattern on a formatted surface with an electronic reading device, wherein positions of the electronic

Appl. No. 09/774,141
Amendment dated July 9, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 04/09/2003

Docket No. 34650-00672USPT
P13979US2

reading device relative to the formatted surface are determined based on the detected portions of the address pattern; sending information relating to the detected portions of the address pattern to an electronic display device; converting said information into feedback relating to the detected portions of the address pattern; and displaying said feedback relating to the detected portions of the address pattern on the electronic display device. For similar reasons as those discussed in regard to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 distinguishes over Buckley in view of Sasaki and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 and 16-21 are dependent upon and further limit independent claims 1 and 15. For at least the reasons as discussed in regard to independent claims 1 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-14 and 16-21 also distinguish over Buckley in view of Sasaki and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 2-14 and 16-21 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/774,141
Amendment dated July 9, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 04/09/2003

Docket No. 34650-00672USPT
P13979US2

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST,
A Professional Corporation



Michael W. Maddox
Reg. No. 47,764

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799
(214) 855-4614
(214) 855-4300 (fax)